

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are currently pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Dickie* (U.S. 2003/0041206), and Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dickie* in view of *Block et al.* (U.S. 5,113,403). Claim 6 is believed to have been rejected under § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Dickie*.

With regard to the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Dickie*. The present claims are distinguishable over *Dickie* for the following reasons. First, as presently claimed an optical alignment system of the present invention is mounted on a cradle housing, while an IR transceiver of *Dickie* is installed at a PDA's first end 304. That is, the IR transceiver of *Dickie* may correspond to the optical alignment system of the present invention only if the IR transceiver of *Dickie* is installed on the cradle housing. However, the optical alignment system of the present invention is not installed in a portable terminal. As such in *Dickie* there is no optical alignment *system* mounted at a predetermined position of the cradle housing, as the present claims specify.

Second, the PDA's first end 304 at which the IR transceiver of *Dickie* is installed is hidden inside the computer housing, i.e., a second end 308 protrudes. On the contrary, the optical alignment system of the present invention is protected by being hidden in a desk-top housing or is exposed outside. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are distinguishable over *Dickie*. As such reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 102 (a) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-8, they are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-3

and 5-8 are respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written in a cursive style.

Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484

Fax: (516) 228-8516